

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated July 14, 2005 in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and rejected claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

As indicated above, claims 1 and 6 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claim. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 1 claims a head arm assembly and claim 6 claims a disk drive assembly including at least one information recording disk and at least one head arm assembly. The head arm assembly comprises a head slider, high-stiffness arm member, a flexure, and actuator and a resilient plate spring. The head slider has at least one head element. The high-stiffness arm member generates no load. The flexure has one end section fixed to one end section of the arm member. The flexure is fixed to the head slider and has a resilience for determining flying attitude of the head slider. The actuator, mounted to the other end section of the arm member, is for rotationally moving the arm member in a direction substantially parallel with a recording medium surface around a horizontal rotation axis of the arm member. The resilient plate spring is for generating a load. The plate spring has one end section fixed to the arm member and the other end section provided with a load point that is not fixed to but abutted to the flexure for energizing the head slider in a direction to the recording medium surface.

Through the structure of the claimed invention having a resilient spring plate having one end fixed to an arm member and the other end provided with a load point that is not fixed to but abutted to the flexure for energizing the head slider in a

direction to the recording medium surface, as claimed in claims 1 and 6, the claimed invention provides a head arm assembly and disk drive apparatus therewith with improved wind resistance, impact resistance in a Z-direction and simplified manufacturing process. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 6.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Hudson et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,229,677).

Hudson et al. appears to disclose an actuator arm apparatus in a disc drive system (col. 1, lines 13-14). FIG. 3 shows a close up top plan view of a read/write head gimbal assembly 4. A gimbal 44 is coupled to the flexure 3. The gimbal 44 supports a slider 42 and a read/write head 41 in such a manner that the read/write head 41 and slider 42 can pitch and roll with respect to disc surface fluctuations. FIGS. 4A and 4B shows a close-up edge view of a stacked disc drive system. The outer upper actuator arm 31 and outer lower actuator arm 33 are positioned a particular z-height 12 from the plane of the disc surface 36 or 37 of the memory disc 34 or 35. The z-height 12 is measured from the surface of the mounting support 2 to the plane of the disc surface 36 or 37 of their corresponding memory disc. So, when the disc is at rest, the z-height is constant for the entire horizontal surface of each upper and lower mounting arms 2U, 2L. The inner actuator arms 32 are paired together and each arm in the pair is in contact with the other arm in the pair in a back-to-back configuration. Such a configuration prevents deflection of the inner actuator arms because each inner actuator arm resists the force applied by the other inner actuator arm. Therefore, z-height compensation is inapplicable to the inner actuator arms in a back-to-back configuration. Distance 60, the z-height of the inner

actuator arms, is greater than the z-height 12 of the outer actuator arms (col. 4, line 53 through col. 5, line 3). The flexure mounting ends 49U, 49L on FIG. 4A of the upper and lower arms 2U, 2L deflect away from the disc, causing the slider to fly too high over the disc (col. 5, lines 21-23).

Thus, *Hudson et al* merely discloses flexure mounting ends 49U, 49L. Nothing in *Hudson et al.* shows, teaches or suggests a resilient plate spring having one end section fixed to an arm member and the other end section provided with a load point that is not fixed to but abutted to the flexure for energizing the head slider in a direction to the recording medium surface as claimed in claims 1 and 6. Rather, *Hudson et al.* merely discloses flexure mounting ends 49U, 49L on the upper and lower arms 2U, 2L which deflect away from the disc causing the slider to fly too high over the disc (col. 5, lines 21-23).

Since nothing in *Hudson et al.* shows, teaches or suggests a resilient spring plate having another end section provided with a load point that is not fixed to but abutted to the flexure for energizing the head slider in a direction to the recording medium surface, as claimed in claims 1 and 6, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend from claims 1 and 6 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5 and 7-10 would not have been anticipated by *Hudson et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Hudson et al.* in view of Goss (U.S. Patent No. 5,786,961).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As discussed above, since nothing in *Hudson et al.* shows, teaches or suggests the primary feature as claimed in claims 1 and 6, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the primary reference of *Hudson et al.* with the secondary reference of *Goss* will not overcome the deficiencies of the primary reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge
our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: October 12, 2005

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Registration No. 32,131

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620